



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,784	04/20/2001	Marco A. DeMello	MSFT-0262/155698.1	1999
27372	7590	08/25/2005	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ MACKIEWICZ & NORRIS LLP ATTENTION: STEVEN J. ROCCI, ESQ. ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			ZHEN, WEI Y	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2191		
DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

K

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/839,784	DEMELLO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Wei Y. Zhen	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/04/05</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

1. This office action is in response to the RCE filed on 6/1/2005.
2. Claims 1-11, 13-30 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 8, 14-15, 23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horstmann, US Patent No. 6,363,356, in view of Newman, US Patent No. 5,983,245 further in view of Chanos et al. US 2002/0120507A1.

As Per Claim 1, Horstmann teaches that the invention makes possible an associates program for electronic content distribution by providing a mechanism whereby a referrer may be identified at the time of purchase in a download-then-pay system. (E.g. see Abstract and associated text). In that Horstmann discloses the method that covering the steps of a method of branding a computer program comprising the acts of: "receiving an indication (E.g. see col. 4:42-62) that a first copy of a computer program (E.g. see col. 4:43, electronic content) has been downloaded (E.g. see col. 4:43, download) to a first computing device (E.g. see col. 4:45, end user machine) and that said first copy is to be branded with information (E.g. Fig. 2 and associated text, e.g. see col. 3:9-25) associated with a first entity (E.g. see col. 4:42-62, identifying information" (E.g. see Fig. 4 and associated text, e.g. see col. 4:42-62); "transmitting first data indicative of said first entity to said first computing device (E.g. see Fig. 4, identifying information 405 and associated text), said first data indicating that said first copy is to be

branded with information associated with said first entity (E.g. see Fig. 2 and associated text, e.g. see col. 3:9-25, col. 4:4-21 and col. 6:4-20); "receiving said first data from said first computing device" (E.g. See Fig. 4, identifying information 409 and associated text) and providing first branding instructions to said first computing device." (E.g. see col. 4:11-13 and see Fig. 2 and associated text, e.g. col. 3:9-25, col. 4:4-21 and col. 6:4-20).

Horstmann does not explicitly disclose placing said first entity first in a list of electronic content-providing entities displayed on said first computing device. However, Newman in an analogous art teaches "placing said first entity first in a list of content- providing entities displayed on said first computing device". (E.g. see FIG. 6, section 386 and associated text, e.g. see col. 9:46 to col. 11 :14, which states "...the newly created URL will now be the most recently used' URL. Accordingly, the newly created URI- will be displayed at the 'top' of the list ...") (Emphasis added). Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Newman into the teaching of Horstmann to place first entity first in a list of content-providing entities. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated so that the user can easily select the most recent URL and does not need to manually type-in over and over again.

Horstmann does not explicitly disclose the first entity comprising a distributor of content to be rendered by the computer program, the computer program comprising content-rendering and content shopping features as claimed. However, Chanos et al discloses a distributor of content to be rendered by the computer program, the computer program comprising content-rendering and content shopping features (E.g. see Page 4, Section 0041 and Page 14, Section 0129). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Chanos into the system of Horstmann and Newman, to provide a distributor of content to be rendered by the computer program, the computer program comprising content-rendering and content shopping features as claimed. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide a customer multiple choices to purchase software.

See the previous office action for rejections to claims 5, 8, 14, 23 and 27 above.

Claim 15 is amended in the similar manner as claim 1 above, see the previous office action in combination with the rejection to claim 1 above for the rejection of claim 15.

4. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horstmann in view of Newman, further in view of Carolan et al. US Patent No. 6,753,887 and further in view of Chanos et al. US 2002/0120507A1.

See previous office action for the rejection.

5. Claims 6-7 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horstmann, in view of Newman, further in view of Bates et al. US Patent No. 6,037,935 and in view of Chanos et al. US 2002/0120507A1.

See the previous office action for the rejection.

6. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horstmann in view of Newman, further in view of Philyaw US Patent No. 6,636,896 and in view of Chanos et al. US 2002/0120507A1.

See the previous office action for the rejection.

7. Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horstmann in view of Newman, further in view of Chanos et al. US 2002/0120507A1.

See the previous office action for the rejection.

8. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horstmann in view of Newman, further in view of Bukszar et al. US Patent No. 6,133,916 and Chanos et al. US 2002/0120507A1.

See the previous office action for the rejection.

9. Claims 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horstmann in view of Newman, further in view of Bukszar, further in view of Philyaw and Chanos et al. US 2002/0120507A1.

See the previous office action for the rejection.

10. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis et al. US Patent No. 5,835,732 in view of Newman further in view of Chanos et al. US 2002/0120507A1.

As Per Claim 28, Kikinis discloses a method for distributing a variation of software through one of a plurality of entities, comprising: "providing a standardized version of software from a first entity and an indication that said standardized version of software is to be branded (E.g. see col. 12: 52-57)", and "providing a customized version of said software as a function of one of a plurality of entities (E.g. see col. 12: 40-42)". In fact, as shown in F1G.1, the content partners (500) means more than one entity.

Kikinis does not explicitly disclose placing said first entity first in a list of electronic content-providing entities displayed on said first computing device. However, Newman in an analogous art teaches "placing said first entity first in a list of content- providing entities displayed on said first computing device". (E.g. see FIG. 6, section 386 and associated text, e.g. see col. 9:46 to col. 1 1:14, which states t& . . . the newly created URL will now be "the most

"recently used" IJRL. Accordingly, the newly created IJRI.- will be displayed at the "top" of the list ..."). Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Newman into the teaching of Kikinis to place first entity first in a list of content-providing entities. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated so that the user can easily select the most recent URL and does not need to manually type-in over and over again.

Horstmann does not explicitly disclose the first entity comprising a distributor of content to be rendered by the computer program, the computer program comprising content-rendering and content shopping features as claimed. However, Chanos et al discloses a distributor of content to be rendered by the computer program, the computer program comprising content-rendering and content shopping features (E.g. see Page 4, Section 0041 and Page 14, Section 0129). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Chanos into the system of Horstmann and Newman, to provide a distributor of content to be rendered by the computer program, the computer program comprising content-rendering and content shopping features as claimed. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide a customer multiple choices to purchase software.

11. Claims 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horstmann, in view of Newman and further in view of Carolan et al. US Patent No. 6,753,887 and Chanos et al. US 2002/0120507A1.

As Per Claim 29, Horstmann teaches a system for branding a computer program comprising: a first computing device which comprises: "memory which stores branding

instructions for one of a plurality of entities (E.g. see col. 2-.49-53.)" Horstmann does not discloses "said one of said plurality of sets of branding instructions comprising instructions to place a first entity first in a list of content-providing entities".

However, Newman in an analogous art teaches "placing said first entity first in a list of content- providing entities displayed on said first computing device". (E.g. see FIG. 6, section 386 and associated text, e.g. see col. 9:46 to col. 1 1:14, which states "...the newly created URL will now be "the most recently used" IJRL. Accordingly, the newly created IJRI.- will be displayed at the "top" of the list ..."). Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Newman into the teaching of Horstmann to place first entity first in a list of content- providing entities. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated so that the user can easily select the most recent URL and does not need to manually type-in over and over again.

Horstmann and Newman do not explicitly disclose a network interface communicatively coupled to a computer network and logic which communicates one of a plurality of sets of branding instructions to a second computing device through said network interface. However, Carolan in an analogous art teaches a network interface (E.g. see FIG. 2A, network interface device 201 and associated text) communicatively coupled to a computer network and logic which communicates one of a plurality of sets of branding instructions to a second computing device (E.g. see FIG. 1, client 101-104 and associated text) through said network interface". Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Carolan into the teaching of Horstmann and Newman to use a network interface to communicate branding instructions to a second computing device. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated so that the link (brand indicia) are presented to the more computer devices (in same computer network).

Horstmann does not explicitly disclose content-rendering and content shopping features as claimed. However, Chanos et al discloses content rendering and content shopping features (E.g. see Page 4, Section 0041 and Page 14, Section 0129). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Chanos into the system of Horstmann, to provide content-rendering and content shopping features as claimed. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide a customer multiple choices to purchase software.

See the previous office action for the rejection of claim 30.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wei Y. Zhen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3708. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wei Zhen
8/19/2005



WEI Y. ZHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER